

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 5 and 8.

Claims 5-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maki et al. (U.S. 6,515,568) in view of Hayashi (JP 05-036532). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 5-18.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite:

A laminated coil comprising:

a laminated body including a non-magnetic body section and magnetic body sections provided on both main surfaces of the non-magnetic body section, the magnetic body sections including a plurality of stacked magnetic layers, the non-magnetic body section including at least one layer of a non-magnetic layer; and

a coil including coil conductors provided in the laminated body, the coil conductors being helically connected; wherein

at least one of the coil conductors is provided inside the non-magnetic body section or on each of the main surfaces of the non-magnetic body section;

**at least one of the coil conductors is provided inside the magnetic body sections; and**

**the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the non-magnetic body section or on each of the main surfaces of the non-magnetic body section is greater than the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the magnetic body sections.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's Claim 8 recites features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 5, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that Maki et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claims 5 and 8, except for the width of the conductor inside the non-magnetic body section is greater than that of the coil conductor provided in the laminated body. The Examiner further alleged that Hayashi et al. discloses a coil conductor provided on both main surfaces of the body section wherein the width d2 greater than d1 of the laminated layer.

Thus, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious “to have the coil conductor width in the non-magnetic section being greater than that of the coil conductor in the body as taught by Hayashi to the coil conductor as disclosed by Maki. The motivation would have been to stabilize the stray capacitance.”

Applicant’s Claim 5 has been amended to recite the features of “at least one of the coil conductors is provided inside the magnetic body sections” and “the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the non-magnetic body section or on each of the main surfaces of the non-magnetic body section is greater than the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the magnetic body sections.” Applicant’s Claim 8 has been similarly amended. Support for these features is found, for example, in paragraphs [0022] to [0031] of Applicant’s originally filed Substitute Specification and in Figs. 1-8 of Applicant’s originally filed drawings.

In contrast to Applicant’s Claims 5 and 8, each and every layer 1-1 to 1-3 of the laminated body of Hayashi is defined by a non-magnetic dielectric layer that is made of the same material (see, for example, paragraph [0002] of the English language machine translation of Hayashi). Hayashi fails to teach or suggest any magnetic layers whatsoever or even that the layers 1-1 to 1-3 could or should be made of different materials, much less that some of the layers 1-1 to 1-3 could or should be made of a non-magnetic material while other ones of the layers 1-1 to 1-3 could or should be made of a magnetic material.

Thus, Hayashi et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of “at least one of the coil conductors is provided inside the magnetic body sections” and “the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the non-magnetic body section or on each of the main surfaces of the non-magnetic body section is greater than the conductor width of the at least one of the coil conductors provided inside the magnetic body sections” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 5, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 8.

Application No. 10/596,632  
January 6, 2010  
Reply to the Office Action dated October 9, 2009  
Page 8 of 8

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Maki et al. and Hayashi, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claims 5 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maki et al. in view of Hayashi.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5 and 8 are allowable. Claims 6, 7, and 9-18 depend upon Claims 5 and 8, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 5 and 8 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 6, 2010

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**

1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710